

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-49 are pending.

Claims 1, 10, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The corresponding dependent claims were accordingly rejected.

Claims 1-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Moran et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,717,879 issued February 1998, in view of Ludwig et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,802,294 issued September 1998.

Counsel for Applicant would like to express his appreciation for the Examiner's time and attention during a telephonic discussion November 18, 2004 to discuss the claims and the cited references, though an agreement was not reached.

As to the Section 101 rejection, counsel for Applicants is appreciative for the Examiner's suggestion for correction of the claims. Claims 1, 10, and 33 have been amended according to the Examiner's suggestion.

The two WIPO references (WO 02/058432 and WO 01/13522) were cited in an IDS mailed June 16, 2004, along with 52 other references, but they apparently were not found in that IDS submission. Consequently, the two WIPO references were not considered. Submitted herewith is an IDS citing additional references, including the two WIPO references, for consideration by the Examiner.

Notice is made that the instant application is related to co-pending and commonly owned U.S. Application Nos. 09/728,453 and 09/728,560, both of which were filed November 30, 2000. The IDS mailed June 16, 2004 includes references common to the two applications as of June 16, 2004.

**The Present Invention**

The present invention relates to information management during a collaborative effort. Claim 1, for example, recites computer executable method that includes a step of recording activity among participants in the collaborative effort. A salient aspect of the invention is the computer performing a step "of analyzing said recorded meeting data to identify

one or more cues contained in said recorded meeting data while said meeting is ongoing.” The one or more cues constitutes a participant directive which represents an action to be performed on some information. Though this aspect of the invention was recited in the claims as originally filed, the amendment was made to emphasize performance of the action of analyzing the recorded meeting data to identify cues, and hence participant directives. When the participant directive is identified, the action that the participant directive represents is performed.

Independent claims 10, 23, and 33 have been amended in similar fashion. For example, independent claim 10 recites an action of “analyzing either or both of said video recording or said audio recording to identify cues contained therein to detect a participant directive.” Independent claim 23 recites a detection component configured to “analyze either or both of said video recordings or said audio recording to thereby identify a participant directive.” Independent claim 33 recites “analyzing said textual information or said image information to detect attendee action cues from said audio data component or said video data component.”

Independent claim 42 as originally filed recites “a cue detection portion configured to detect attendee action cues from said textual information during said meeting.” As will be explained next, independent claim 42 and the amended independent claims are patentably distinct over the cited art.

#### **“analyzing said recorded meeting data ...”**

An aspect of the present invention is “analyzing said recorded meeting data to identify one or more cues contained in said recorded meeting data” where the one or more cues constitutes a participant directive. *Claim 1.* Moran does not show this aspect of the invention. Moreover, Ludwig combined with Moran do not show this aspect of the invention.

Ludwig describes techniques for combining video and audio information from multiple sources in a CMW (collaborative multimedia workstation). In column 11, line 64 and following, Ludwig describes video mosaicing to combine multiple video signals for display on a CMW. Column 12, line 55 and following discloses audio mixing that is used in conjunction with the video mosaic.

The Examiner noted that Ludwig can be combined with Moran “so that Moran can display recordings of all participants (i.e., Figures 13-15) during a session meeting.” *OA, page 11, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, last sentence.* However, the combination does not result in “analyzing said recorded meeting data to identify one or more cues contained in said recorded meeting data.” Neither Moran nor Ludwig describe or suggest analyzing a recorded meeting to identify such cues where the cues indicate a participant directive.

**“... while said meeting is ongoing”**

Another aspect of the present invention is “analyzing said recorded meeting data to identify one or more cues contained in said recorded meeting data while said meeting is ongoing.” *Claim 1.* Moran does not show this aspect of the invention. Moreover, Ludwig combined with Moran do not show this aspect of the invention.

Ludwig teach a system for combining multiple video and audio sources in a way that is suitable for display on a CMW. A review of Ludwig does not reveal a description about performing an analysis of the video or audio, and there does not appear to be any discussion about performing such an analysis while the meeting is ongoing. Column 3, lines 1-20 were cited. However, a review of that citation reveals the “[t]eleconferences may be recorded and stored for later playback, including both audio/video and all data interactions.” (*underlining added*). The phrase “for later playback” clearly does not suggest “while said meeting is ongoing” as recited in the amended claims.

Moran, likewise, describes performing playback of the recorded meeting. For example, Figure 13 of Moran shows a user annotating a playback of the recorded meeting via the note (1302). This is very clearly discussed by Morag at column 23, lines 12-25, reproduced below:

“A point and click operation on the different visual indicators may cause different things to occur. In each case, the subsequent playback of the timestreams will be set to the time corresponding to the beginning of the visual indicator. In the case of Notes, a window containing the text in the note is opened. The occurrence of such an operation is illustrated in FIG. 13. Referring to FIG. 13, the visual indicator 1301 has been pointed to and the switch on the cursor control device clicked. This causes a text window 1302 to be opened containing the text generated during the meeting (here

the text "Good Point Made By Betty. Need to Use that Argument in Meeting With the Boss"). It should be noted that the text window may also be presented in a different location outside the time track display area." *(underlining added).*

Neither Moran nor Ludwig show or even suggest analyzing "while said meeting is ongoing".

**“... performing said action represented by said participant directive”**

Still another aspect of the present invention is "performing said action represented by said participant directive" where the participant directive was identified by analyzing the recorded meeting for cues, while the meeting is ongoing.

Referring to the Office Action on page 3, last paragraph, the Examiner asserted that:

"Moran teaches identifying a participant directive via accessing meeting data via button events initiated by participants during an ongoing meeting, the event indicators being color coded to identify a participant, with each button event indicative of a directive, as well as buttons and notes (i.e. a service - indicating a participant who feels something significant is being discussed) (Moran column 22 lines 1-20, Figure 13)."

Assuming *arguendo* that a button event is indicative of a directive as the Examiner asserts, that does not show "performing said action represented by said participant directive." The button event is not associated with an action to be performed. Moran merely records the fact the a button event occurred (i.e., pressed). Moran does not show that system analyses the recorded meeting to thereby identify the occurrence of a button event. Moran does not show that system identifies the button event from an analysis of the recorded meeting as being a participant directive that is associated with an action to be performed. Moran does not show that the system performs an action as a result of identifying the button event.

Referring to the Office Action on page 11, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the Examiner appears to assert that this aspect of the invention is shown by Moran, stating "[i]n clicking on a button, and appending a note (Moran item 1302), a participant directs the system to make note, and records the annotation accordingly."

First, the note (1320) that is made is not an action that was identified by analysis of the recorded meeting. Quite the contrary, the note making is performed by a user playing

Appl. No. 09/521,252  
Amdt. sent January 21, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2004

PATENT

back a recorded meeting. This is clearly described in column 23, lines 12-25, quoted above. There is no analysis of the recorded meeting to identify an action that represents making of the note (1302). The note (1302) was made by a user who was reviewing the recorded meeting. Second, this note making does not occur while the meeting is in progress. As mentioned above, the note (1302) is made during a "subsequent playback."

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



George B. F. Yee  
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
GBFY:cmm  
60344506 v1